

Question:

Does CDI and Schroeder propose an indefinitely prolonged moratorium even if SU does not agree to (what R regards as) an "adequate" number of stations and expanded on-site inspections?

i.e. at least 3 years, $3\frac{1}{2}$ years...?

If not, is moratorium unifiable?

Acceptable — e.g. to most in Congress?

Is this a valid basis for NPT/Post dismissal?

Or should moratorium be limited to 6 mos. — 1 year — enough time to negotiate a CTB?

(Congress could decide whether to extend it, based on evaluation of progress in negot. — as coercion of R, if necessary. ... or end it, if SU not forthcoming.)

Basis for public opinion 1954-63: fall-out.

Now: fear of nuclear war

fear of prolif

desire to stop arms race.

CDI may have misjudged: — PR value of Ag 6 stand. (in US)

— impact of SU intention

— "Salvo value" of an "uninterrupted moratorium"

(vs., perhaps, flight-test moratorium)

ASAT-moratorium — which NPT defers and Congress did pass.

Is there a press-roots motive for CTB?!

Note — lack of "celebration" of end of SU testing!

What if moratorium were ended either: (1) SU tested

or (2) [~~Pass~~ SU proved willing to provide for adequate verif.

But — is "testing while talking" a way to get a treaty?
or to show adequate "good faith" for NPT?

Yes: Even with a friendly Pres, moratorium offers of
"evidence of good faith" to SU, and to NNWSP.

It worries opponents of a test ban, in US (+ Allies)
and those very skeptical of SU, or
who want to appear to be.

And SU moratorium worries the just as much,
if joined by US.

So, why moratorium now?

— NPT Review!

(Well, it's too late!)

Self. Moratorium would be better than mutual testing
(despite risk of cheating)

But majority of Congress would not back on
unilateral moratorium (= absence of unig. CTB) — even with a
favorable Pres:

and certainly won't oppose a hostile Pres on this!

limited-time moratorium — of US — could be proposed on SU
to prevent verifiable unig, keep US from resuming
in CTB

This is what Murelle, Hunt agreed to!

On SU limited moratorium could press R to negotiate
— "to keep SU from resuming."

Congress could do this for Quirk Truce — to stop new weapons,
tell new Pres. Public could do this — if our movement was still
strong enough. But, test moratorium?

Other countries can call for moratorium with
"international inspection" (Sawley, 176; Nov 6, 1962)

Es - interpret 5-month moratorium (+ SC offer to continue)

as (1) evidence of SC "good faith" intent in CTB

(it would not continue unless a CTB:

i.e. US would be expected to think)

US; and NNVSP

2) Pressure on US to negot CTB

(not, to join indep. moratorium!)

3) esp. pressure on US from NAT Powers:

US isolated, i.e.

a) refusing to join moratorium

b) refusing to negot

c) uninf. demands

(But US can: 1) join limited-period moratorium —
long enough to negot. CTB

("5 months — or longer, if SC is negotiating
in good faith.") ② Negot CTB

3) Press SC on uninf.

unless US (admits it) doesn't want uninf. CTB.

(Without moratorium, SC's own good faith desire
for end of testing would be in question — it would not
have responded to NPT/UN demand for action;
it would not have focused pressure on US, it would
not have put US subject to the test of whether it would
accept uninf. CTB, since US could claim it doubted
SC's will.

800 words

Has SC even accepted principle of obligation
on-site inspection (since K's "3", in 1963 - withdrawn J pg)
- York?

SC is responding to foreign desire for open-ended
moratorium

[von Hippel: asked Perle, "What would you bear?"

Perle: "Nothing."

[call von Hippel: Princeton

Cong/

[CDI has only failed to generate "a great popular
movement" for a test ban
in Congress, SAME

In 1983-84 we could hope that Freeze would be
adequate to get Quick Freeze out of Congress —
esp. with a friendly Pres

(i.e. push + back up Pres)

otherwise, as "last resort"

(if we were strong, But we aren't.

Could sign at flight-test moratorium, which
— with chief — but not test ban which!

(Why didn't Perle even mention this?!)

Pres QF is valid! (leading to CTB: as Mandel said).

here, Mandel called for
6-month moratorium.

But not

Congressional "Quick ^{me} Test Moratorium" — effort

gives long history of Cong/Pres/USC rejection of
"unilateral test ban"

NPT Review -

Prolif

JFK thought it crucial for prolif - so did the
so do NNWS...

Moratorium necessary... for NPT!

If Congress can't get moratorium when SU has started it,
will it? 1989-90? If both are testing

(Altho no point did CTB itself seem crucial to
it "as control" in itself - yet it was, in retrospect

(X-bomb ban

ICBMs

tee wres

N-bomb

Emphasis on stopping launches - not MIRV

accuracy
SDI

we had
yet tests were more

unfirable than anyth but large launches -

(which no one tried to stop -
and which were not closely
related to stability (even MIRV)

i.e. Inherent Aggression of 1968, start
of SALT-I (except as true "first step":
MCN; Control - not N, F, R

SU has given Congress a choice: both can be tested in

R does not want to end the arms race; now
end testing now

" " " try to end it — but it succeeded, proving,
(the SU would give him an offer he can't refuse)
He won't specify conditions for ending but the
SU accept the —

and this preclude 1/2, 0.5, X-ray laser, H-bomb
was - fighting...

He claims not to trust the ...

Stone

Filibuster on Senate Approp. bill

Philip Villus - philanthropist in Boston

2 Senators who got interested

I don't think it will get anywhere

Not just that

3rd generation weapons
more than the usual

Goatloff: Deterrence and Confrontation
need ^{position} Center on test ban

Mutual confidence fusion - little pellets
division - ~~stop~~ sincerely quit
under IKT

Ray Kishen - sympathetic to a IKT test ban
military effectiveness is above ~~the~~ IKT

Wouldn't deploy something ^{on tests} under IKT
a test

Pike

Brown

If USAF gives said (e.g. Gen Gabriel, USAF C of C)
("We had more to lose in attacking satellites

Hyde will introduce modifications to NV Res 3

(drinking wine)

in the face of deep reductions

first need to have deep reductions agreed in House

in order to have CTB negot

20-25 supporters of bill now who would support Hyde amendments —

(Kagan may have gotten his from Hyde)

Wamke — on NBC

he would not support the moratorium,
not a good idea

Dave supports a CTB

"Some effort was speaking to the US people

Kennedy's CA — fish sticking left — new one coming on
K will reintroduce in October

King won't go ahead on his own — defers to Kennedy

No sense of H or Senate referring to SC moratorium

Dave staying away, don't want to look soft on Cons

No way to stop the first ASAT Test — but
could go back on next 2 (of 3) tests

NPT Review — how much criticism?

Summit — how much dashed hopes

— Could be public outcry to join monitoring

If NPTs 3 persons

if

After for 86 — let down, our battle will be
doubly hard

Schreiner?

date of Julio's birth!)

Congress is just not willing to go up against a popular Pres.

Frost

Have Foreign Affairs

Joe Rye - "I disagree that a test ban is important"

Congress is moving to the right

ELK - without final count or rounding up support....

Dugger introduced a substitute - awful - have to vote first - but would have won!

Schroeder bill will be blocked in Committee

- Approp. bill amendment on appropriations
Prospects less in Senate, (Hatfield) after finance

Not for attribute: "Unless US agrees to moratorium and
reopens negotiations on CTB

We are going to cancel our debt and withdraw

2/1

(Argentina!)

2/1

ASEAN countries called for
Neutral non-aligned

Sten Rohl - was Singapore

Folk:

statement of judge to jury

Frank Mahady, State of Vt. vs. John Kellen, Nov 1984
trespass in office of US Sen. Stopped on contraband
(he actually changed his position, after!)

Allowed to use necessary defense;

F test. a proper charge, and no effort to witness;

In writing which implies injury from the emergency
[in this] anticipated the alleged criminal wrong

the threatened act would not be perceived as a crime

the jury did not have to decide

However,...

You should understand that int. law is law, and
that it is binding on the US...

7
Bund Hill Road
Falk: Hardwick, VC. 05843
609-921-0259

Moony Morris
Falk: SF 5-8 Sept 1983
IPS- (Rashin, Bourgeois)

Kangas' Committee on Nuclear Policy
Daniel Arbes, Exec. Dir. ²¹² 334-8044 office
(KANGAS) L (West 75th St.)
724-5639

"If we don't take the Const. seriously..."

When Congress isn't playing its Const. role, as
check ... better case for establishing standing
acute illegality - do whatever is effective to overcome that - including
going to jail - but that shouldn't be the result of their action
Falk at Riverview Church on Aug. 8 - because you're
acting in a reasonable,
if Congress legitimate way

Mischigish Institute...

"Kangas' civil disobedience" (like PD)
under credible cover of law
opposing gov illegality - in a NV way
constructive violation of lesser laws
subordinate
(not just mindless religious conviction)

The two serious offenses are better cases for raising
legal issues (vs., property destruction ^{case} - which others,
conflicting values).

Solo - Frege Conf, Schneider

Bert - ~~272-3830~~ 273-3820

Jane Thurman - 14 Aug 85 Wed
i Will Howard of UK Frege

Frege + SANE

Petition drive: to R + G

- Halt to Testing, as first step to Frege

2000 P St. 20036

Com. for Nat. Sec.

833-3140

Groups working with Wainke, Ann Cohen

822-7483

to get

Kam Mulhaver

[Ford + Carter

Jane Wales

847-7990

McNamara, Kenan, Harriman

Jackson? Mondale; Schles? Bishops York

CDI

Rusk?

Vance

No unified media strategy

Hatfield

Kush/Buill

Congressional strategy

HJ Res 3 -

Facilitate an approx bill?

Kennedy? Kerry?

(Bishops
Lawyers

CDI plays a lone hand -
coord. broken down on Schroeder bill

Frege Conf:

1st Day: Amb. Thorsen

2nd Day - moving beyond

Frege + Art. 6

info to concrete strategy

the plan - status of lobbying efforts or
NPT

View of Art. 6 from negotiators

non-negotiators

View from East, & West

V6: "This (fall) is our chance — if we can't seize it, we might as well go home."

Pam Loh & Fine: working on a joint statement — SV initiative — ways to highlight

190 signed up (Japan, Spain:

— explore role of negotia

Cooper Brown — lawyer in Wash who would —

agitated that HJR 3 does not go far enough —

2 a lot of groups are calling Schroeder to support her bill (30 co-sponsors

"former War Veterans, etc vets...

WSP, WILPF

True that her

"Co-sponsorship process for Schroeder will help get an amendment...

Getting signals from Kennedy & Bedell

Cong. back into session on Sept 4 — preoccupied on budget

PS skeptical whether HJR 3 will even get to the floor...

Don't like to hang on hat on
bureaucratic obligations

Monday - 1st strike

13 Aug

Daniel Arbes
will be here

(Canadian, who came to
World Policy Inst.

with Mary Underberger

30th Aug - Bay Area

with Jerry Sanders

Even

on Bull of Atom Sci, Arbes + Epstein
came months ago

Orig. invitation of Langens' Committee
was on illegality of war

"Intention: (USG) will not be willing to
see a test-ban till FC + threats are
rejected.

"Illegality of FC"

"Alternatives to nuclear deterrence"

from issue of
Harpers

"Put a third rail into the agenda

alt. to "MAD + arms control"

and to "Star Wars" (O-6...)

Mendelsohn
Johnson

... reducing reliance on nuclear weapons and a mil. force

Am Cohn

Yank, AAAS in May ^{US-SU}
said "how far apart" they were on CTB in 1978

Yank did seem more favorable to SDT:

"Has a paper less opposed than expected."

(Pat's son)
Tony Scoville - writes for Harrison

McG B - writes his on, & others

~~Maybe~~ Question whether Mondell would be helpful.

Gene Canall: COI

WH offered exclusives to each network
"no opponents allowed"

Moving to COI -

"go to Congress

- take away the money

Have to

C3 problems

COI Policy Inst: C4 lobbying

Schwarzer bill has been redrafted,
to focus on fear 1 - moratorium

use bill as
vehicle -
outside

Bedell + Lusk HVRs 3 (Kennedy-Mathias)
... doing business as usual

Moving Monday

DOE approp. has already been passed

O'Neill can make it on amendment to DOO approp.
(referring to military weapons - no money for testing...
there, problem with Senate)

In SU, Canall + K&R met with Arbitator
(A: "SU would be 'conceding,' 'weakling'...")

Coalition is afraid of COI "owning" the issue, and
getting in the way of HVRs 3 Coalition

"We were terribly excited for the first 12

Wanda said it was propaganda! ["because they know the US won't buy it"]!

Barbara Stein / Carl's wife attacked it - no apology...

York: "SDI offers some promise, under some conditions" - doc. he's circulating

Dun (Wanda) seem to feel that because Mor. was so sure

they will be turned as pro-Soviet

Paul Newman had personally approved (believed)

only 4 had agreed to be on ad

"that they favored careful consideration of the proposal, public debate ... treating it as serious..."

~~Not subject~~ to that - ...

{ Colley

{ Ball

{ Gerald Smith

yes

23-27th

Rush, McN, Clifford & Vance

"waffled ... not now ... didn't want a public position..." (in view of R's successful manipulation of news)

Brown, Schles, Hammer, Brown flat turn-down

Ch'ne Estate

"Not going to break with Admin when Admin has high (PR) ground" ["supporting SU propaganda" - given success of Admin's PR on this in front 48 hrs - they can't turn it around, i.e. they don't want the risk of trying...]
on SDI they did - with efforts with

Robin, knowing SU action was coming,
offered each network an exclusive —
McFarlane, Weinberger ...
on conditions:

1) No opposition figure!

Thus, CBI was told, no chance to get a McKeith-
Lerner ... (Koppel?)

No one will confirm this for attribution...

So now, Dan elicits an offer of being turned on
for "propaganda"!

(or undermining summit!)

(see Wamda in '69, w/rt "Moratorium")!

Roskin

WAF R 667-1828

234-9382

The War System

History of disintegration of war & peace - US

A-Bomb - Her Alarming

Nat. Sec. State Roskin

Budget: Bill Cannon
Organizing

from Jackson Tues night
IF Stone Wed night

Sunday

Thurs - Alt. ideas

This proposal is an American one - peace movement...

Wiesner - 1983 paper



Rockefeller Hall

45 Francis Ave.

Off. Killed

Arkin Alarming

Contingent

Ehman

Falk

Rothman

SCLC

from Sharp

Robert Lewis

Isipis

Wells

Fahnestock

My Mitchell

DE:

Shurman
alternatives
monetary, Dittus

Kate's number?

Robert

Carroll

(Paris; MHH; Forsberg...

(Keller?)

Carroll/Le Roy?

Thomson?)

Frege? - Hummer?

Common Cause?

money -

Thos Mitchell 16 Aug 85

Monday night: Aug 30 - Network handling of
all 3 ^{returned} ~~had~~ with Space Shuttle

all 3 emphasized the ^{US} ~~SA~~ offer

Reporters called it

Norley Stahl - CBS - 4 times called it propaganda

20 sec - McNeil - Kibben

On Aug. 6 - not one paper mentioned that
SU had stopped testing.

Reporters want to appear cynical of SU "propaganda"

Feedback on my piece:

some feel, "you can't talk hardcore (FS)
to public - not talk 'values' (?), patriotism,
pro-military... (!)"

Mitchell: not surprised by story of
"explanations" to networks

Harrison Salisbury - likewise (happens a lot)

Harrison Salisbury 16 Aug 85

HAK will never get into R Admin -
tho' he's afraid he would take it over (like N)
from a weak Pres

He's bitter, dependent - drinking...
shut out...

Max Frankel has on NYT a page for 5-6
years (R Admin) - shift from for Oakes
(vs. test bar...)

His greatest influence is HAK - and occasionally
departs from HAK line.

Congress.
~~Repeals~~ afraid of big united pro-Con -
will keep hands down till Nov '86 (!)